

REMARKS

Claims 22, 24-30, and 48-54 are now pending in the application and stand rejected. Claims 22 and 29 are amended. Upon entry of the amendments, claims 22, 24-30, and 48-54 remain pending.

Support for the amendment to claim 22 is found in the specification as originally filed, for example at paragraph [0032]. Support for the amendment to claim 29 is found for example at paragraph [0035] of the specification. Applicants respectfully request entry of the amendments.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 29 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Applicants have amended claim 29 to depend from claim 26, mooting the indefiniteness rejection of former claim 29. Applicants respectfully request the rejection be withdrawn.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 22, 24, 26, 28-30, 48, and 50-53 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Takahira reference (US 6,395,360) in view of the Gerard reference (US 5,929,167). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection as applied to the amended claims and request reconsideration.

The Takahira reference does not disclose a coextruded A-B-A composite sheet having layers A-B-A wherein A is a unitary expendable polymeric layer, as recited in the amended claims. Instead, as set forth in section 8 of the Office Action, the release liner 4 of the reference is multilayer and is not unitary. The secondary Gerard reference is cited for its disclosure of a pressure sensitive adhesive composition made of thermoplastic polyurethane. Applicants respectfully submit that the Gerard reference does not make up for the deficiencies of the Takahira reference as applied to the amended claims. That is, even when the disclosures of the two references are combined as suggested in the Office Action, the combined product does not have all the features of the amended claims. For this reason, Applicants respectfully request the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 25, 49, and 54 are rejected as obvious over the Takahira reference in view of the Gerard reference as applied above and further in view of the Caldwell reference (US 3,581,884). The deficiencies of the combined Takahira and Gerard references with respect to the amended claims are discussed above. Applicants respectfully submit that the Caldwell reference does not make up for those deficiencies. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 27 is rejected as obvious over the Takahira and Gerard references as applied above and further in view of the Schacht reference (US 5,096,777). Applicants respectfully submit that the Schacht reference does not make up for the deficiencies of the combined Takahira and Gerard references as applied to amended claim 27. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the rejection be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons discussed above, Applicants believe that amended claims 22, 24-30, and 48-54 are in an allowable condition and respectfully request an early Notice of Allowance. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned if that would be helpful to resolving any issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: September 2, 2009

By: /Mark A. Frentrup/
Mark A. Frentrup
Reg. No. 41,026

HARNES, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MAF/cg